

REMARKS

The present communication responds to the Office Action mailed May 22, 2006. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 10-22 and 24-26 of the present application. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested for the reasons discussed below.

Rejections Under U.S.C. § 103

Ginsburg in view of Gerson

Claims 1, 3-5 and 24-26 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 921,974 to Ginsburg in view of U. S. Patent No. 3,150,582 to Gerson. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner asserts that Ginsburg teaches an interchangeable die apparatus, including: an apparatus for adjusting a die printing press comprising a chase (A, Fig. 1) defining a vertical axis and a horizontal axis, a die frame (B, Fig. 1) slidably secured to the chase to allow the adjustment of the die frame in the vertical axis and the horizontal axis of the chase ("frame may be adjusted to its proper central position," p. 1, lines 62-63). As previously explained, Ginsburg discloses a chase A with die frame B adapted to be set within chase A. Set screws A' are used to engage the sides of the chase for locking the frame in place and for adjusting the frame and chase relative to each other. Ginsburg explains:

The frame B is smaller than the frame A, has no bottom plate, and is adapted to be set within the frame A. The set screws A' will engage with the sides of this frame, and by adjusting the set screws relatively to each other the internal frame B may be adjusted to its proper central position with reference to the frame or chase A and be rigidly held therein. *Ginsburg, page 1, lines 59-65.*

Ginsburg has no teaching or suggestion of slidably securing a die frame within a chase to allow adjustment of the die frame in the vertical axis and the horizontal axis. In contrast, Ginsburg teaches only set screws for locking and adjusting the frame with respect to the chase. Set screws do not provide slidable securing of the frame to the chase. Thus, Ginsburg does not disclose "a

die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow adjustment of the die frame in the vertical axis and the horizontal axis of the chase,” as recited by claim 1.

Further, Ginsburg teaches only very limited movement of a die frame within a chase through proper actuation of set screws. Specifically, Ginsburg’s teaching is limited to only that movement wherein a die frame is adjusted to a sole desired position, which is central with respect to a chase. Ginsburg explains:

The set screws A’ will engage the sides of this frame, and by adjusting the set screws relatively to each other the internal frame B may be adjusted to its proper central position with reference to the frame or chase A and be rigidly held therein. *Ginsburg, page 1, lines 59-65.*

In contrast, claim 1 provides for adjustment of a die frame from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end.

The applicants respectfully submit that Ginsburg does not teach several of the elements of claim 1. In fact, the Examiner concedes that Ginsburg does not teach at least one horizontal guide secured with the chase and at least one vertical guide secured in the chase, the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide slidably connected to the die frame to slidably secure the die frame to the chase and to permit the die frame to be slidably positioned along both the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide; a horizontal mount coupled to the at least one horizontal guide; a vertical mount coupled to the at least one vertical guide; a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis; and at least one of a coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and a coarse horizontal adjustment mechanism; and at least one of a fine vertical adjustment mechanism and a fine horizontal adjustment mechanism, wherein the coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and/or fine vertical adjustment mechanism is coupled to the vertical mount and the coarse horizontal adjustment and/or fine horizontal adjustment mechanism is coupled to the horizontal mount. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that Ginsburg is fundamentally lacking in teaching or suggesting claim 1.

The Examiner attempts to use the Gerson reference to correct the fundamental teaching deficiencies of Ginsburg, alleging that Gerson teaches an apparatus for adjusting a die. As previously discussed, the applicants respectfully note that, at least, Gerson does not in fact teach an apparatus for adjusting a die. Gerson teaches a photo offset plate making machine.

As noted by the Examiner, an object of the Gerson device is to provide a:

structure for the adjustable positioning of the negative carrier support, which affords very rapid and convenient shifting and positioning of said support and quick precise selection of fine space intervals both vertically and horizontally by the mere flicking of two shift levers. *Gerson, Column 1, lines 52-57.*

The Examiner refers to this language in Gerson as disclosing “at least one of a fine vertical adjustment and a fine horizontal adjustment (“precise selection of fine space intervals both vertically and horizontally,” col. 1, lines 55-56); that such an apparatus provides very rapid and convenient shifting and positioning (col. 1, lines 53-56), and precise alignment and the ability to return to predetermined positions as selected by the user (col. 1, lines 45-50).” Claim 1 recites: “at least one of a coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and a coarse horizontal adjustment mechanism”. While the language cited by the Examiner may express an object of Gerson to adjust the position of the negative carrier support, there is no disclosure of the mechanism to do so. Claim 1 recites: “wherein the coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and/or fine vertical adjustment mechanism is coupled to the vertical mount and the coarse horizontal adjustment and/or fine horizontal adjustment mechanism is coupled to the horizontal mount”. Gerson does not disclose coarse and/or fine vertical and/or horizontal adjustment mechanisms coupled to respective guides.

The Examiner asserts Gerson shows wherein “the coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and/or fine vertical adjustment mechanism is coupled to the vertical mount (see Fig. 3, generally for arrangement of vertical mount and adjustment mechanisms)”. In his arguments, the Examiner cites Gerson 33 as showing a fine vertical adjustment mechanism and Gerson 51 as showing a vertical mount. The Examiner refers only to the text of Gerson as disclosing a coarse vertical adjustment (col. 3, lines 39-40) and does not identify any coarse vertical adjustment mechanism. Figure 3 of Gerson shows element 33 (a vertical shift lever) but does not show

Gerson 51 (body of horizontal registering means 30). Accordingly, even in construing the Examiner's arguments, the applicants are unable to identify how the Examiner can assert that Figure 3 illustrates the coarse vertical adjustment mechanism and/or the fine vertical adjustment mechanism coupled to the vertical mount. Gerson Figure 3 does not even show the mechanism identified by the Examiner as being a vertical mount much less anything coupled to such mechanism.

The Examiner further asserts Gerson shows wherein "the coarse horizontal adjustment and/or fine horizontal adjustment mechanism is coupled to the horizontal mount (see Fig. 11 generally for arrangement of horizontal mount and adjustment mechanisms)". In his arguments, the Examiner cites Gerson 76 as showing (presumably) a fine horizontal adjustment mechanism and Gerson 61 as showing a horizontal mount. The Examiner refers only to the text of Gerson as disclosing a coarse horizontal adjustment (col. 4, lines 7-8) and does not identify any coarse horizontal adjustment mechanism. Figure 11 of Gerson shows element 76 (a horizontal shift lever) but does not show Gerson 61 (a housing). Accordingly, even in construing the Examiner's arguments, the applicants are unable to identify how the Examiner can assert that Figure 11 illustrates the coarse horizontal adjustment mechanism and/or the fine horizontal adjustment mechanism coupled to the horizontal mount. Gerson Figure 11 does not even show the mechanism identified by the Examiner as being a horizontal mount much less anything coupled to such mechanism.

Further, Gerson does not teach, at least, an apparatus wherein the at least one horizontal guide and the at least one vertical guide are secured within the chase. The term "chase" is defined in the pending application's specification as follows:

Chase 20 defines a vertical axis 12 and a horizontal axis 14.
Vertical axis 12 and horizontal axis 14 generally form a plane
within which the positions of die 100 may be slidably adjusted.
(*Specification, p. 6*).

Employing this definition in the context of Gerson, the chase is properly described as the plane within which the negative carrier support may be slidably adjusted. This plane, however, is limited to the area of the lithographic plate support 22. Gerson explains:

In the photolithographic process, it is frequently desirable to have multiple images in spaced and predetermined positions on the photolithographic plate. *Gerson, Column 1 lines 12-14*. It is therefore among the principal objects of the present invention to provide an improved machine . . . wherein certain of the components used enable the precise registering of the negatives, with respect to the lithographic plate. *Gerson, Column 1 lines 32-36*.

Gerson teaches only vertical guides 59, 60 that extend beyond lithographic plate support 22. (*Fig. 1*). Thus, Gerson does not disclose an apparatus with “at least one horizontal guide secured within the chase and at least one vertical guide secured in the chase.”

The applicants respectfully note that, at least, Gerson does not teach an apparatus wherein a horizontal guide block is movably secured to a chase to slide along the horizontal axis. Particularly, Gerson teaches only an apparatus wherein two horizontal mounts 61, 62 that allow movement along the horizontal axis. Thus, Gerson does not, in fact, disclose an apparatus with “a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis,” as recited in Claim 1.

Neither Ginsburg nor Gerson, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest “a die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow adjustment of the die frame along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end” and “a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis,” as recited by Claim 1, as amended. Nor do Ginsburg or Gerson, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest providing a die fixture including a chase, the chase defining a vertical and horizontal axis and comprising first and second vertical ends and first and second horizontal ends, and a die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow the die frame to slide along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end,” as recited by claim 24, as amended. Thus, the applicants respectfully assert that claims 1, 3-5, 24 are patentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson be withdrawn.

Ginsburg in view of Gerson and further in view of Leibovich et al.

Claims 10, 12, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 921,974 to Ginsburg in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,150,582 to Gerson and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 4,723,086 to Leibovich et al. This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

As discussed above, neither Ginsburg nor Gerson, alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest, at least, “a die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow adjustment of the die frame along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end” and “a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis,” as recited by Claim 1.

Leibovich et al. disclose a coarse and fine motion positioning mechanism. Leibovich et al. do not correct the fundamental teaching deficiencies of the Ginsburg and Gerson combination. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ginsburg, Gerson and Leibovich et al. does not make obvious claim 1.

As each of claims 10, 12, 17 and 18 depends either directly or indirectly from claim 1, the applicants respectfully assert that claims 10, 12, 17 and 18 are patentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson and further in view of Leibovich et al. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 10, 12, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson and further in view of Leibovich et al. be withdrawn.

Ginsburg in view of Gerson and Leibovich et al. and further in view of Posh

Claims 11, 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 921,974 to Ginsburg in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,723,086 to Leibovich as applied to claims 10, 12 and 18 and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,449,970 to Posh. This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

As discussed above, neither Ginsburg, Gerson nor Leibovich et al., alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest, at least, “a die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow adjustment of the die frame along the chase from the first vertical end to the second

vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end” and “a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis,” as recited by Claim 1.

Posh teaches a linear actuator. Posh does not correct the fundamental teaching deficiencies of the Ginsburg, Gerson and Leibovich et al. combination. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ginsburg, Gerson, Leibovich et al. and Posh does not make obvious claim 1.

As each of claims 11, 13 and 19 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, the applicants respectfully assert that claims 11, 13 and 19 are patentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson and Leibovich et al. and further in view of Posh. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 11, 13 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson and Leibovich et al. and further in view of Posh be withdrawn.

Ginsburg in view of Gerson and Leibovich et al. and further in view of Gortner

Claims 14-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 921,974 to Ginsburg in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,150,582 to Gerson and U.S. Patent No. 4,723,086 to Leibovich et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,598,868 to Gortner. This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

As discussed above, neither Ginsburg, Gerson nor Leibovich et al., alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest, at least “a die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow adjustment of the die frame along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end” and “a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis,” as recited by Claim 1.

Gortner teaches a clamp mechanism. Gortner does not correct the fundamental teaching deficiencies of the Ginsburg, Gerson and Leibovich et al. combination. Thus, it is respectfully

submitted that the combination of Ginsburg, Gerson, Leibovich et al. and Gortner does not make obvious claim 1.

As each of claims 14-16 depends either directly or indirectly from claim 1, the applicants respectfully assert that claims 14-16 are patentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson and Leibovich et al. and further in view of Gortner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson and Leibovich et al. and further in view of Gortner be withdrawn.

Ginsburg in view of Gerson and Leibovich et al. and Gortner and further in view of Posh

Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 921,974 to Ginsburg in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,150,582 to Gerson and U.S. Patent No. 4,723,086 to Leibovich et al. and U.S. Patent No. 6,598,868 to Gortner and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,449,971 to Posh. This rejection is traversed at least for the following reasons.

As discussed above, neither Ginsburg, Gerson, Leibovich et al., nor Gortner, alone or in combination, disclose, teach, or suggest, at least, “a die frame slidably secured to the chase to allow adjustment of the die frame along the chase from the first vertical end to the second vertical end and from the first horizontal end to the second horizontal end” and “a horizontal guide block movably secured to the chase to slide along the horizontal axis,” as recited by Claim 1.

Posh teaches a linear actuator. Posh does not correct the fundamental teaching deficiencies of the Ginsburg, Gerson, Leibovich et al. and Gortner combination. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Ginsburg, Gerson, Leibovich et al., Gortner and Posh does not make obvious claim 1.

As each of claims 20-22 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, the applicants respectfully assert that claims 20-22 are patentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson, Leibovich et al. and Gortner and further in view of Posh. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the

rejection of claims 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginsburg in view of Gerson, Leibovich et al. and Gortner and further in view of Posh be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

This application now stands in allowable form and reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Should any fees be necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 04-1420.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Customer Number 25763

Date:

October 23, 2006

By:

Alicia Griffin Mills
Alicia Griffin Mills
Reg. No. 46,933
(612) 492-6514